

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 4, 6-12, 14-19, and 22 have been amended; claim 23 has been canceled. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Office objects to claims 14 and 16-18 due to alleged informalities. The limitation “a first further winding is arranged on the core” is objected to as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Office asserts that it is not clear whether the term “a first further winding” is referring to one of the windings presented in claim 13 or referring to a new winding. The Office also objects to the limitation “a second further winding is arranged on the core” under a similar reasoning. See Office Action, page 2. Applicants have amended claim 14 to disclose “a first further winding which is additional to said windings of the at least two inductors” and similarly amended claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants contend that the terms “a first further winding” and “a second further winding” are no longer unclear. Further, the Office objects to the terms “resonant circuit(s)” and “the second half of the oscillation cycle” for lack of antecedent basis. See *Id.* Applicants have amended claims 17 and 18 and contend

that these terms no longer lack antecedent basis. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the objections.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 7, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Momotani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,614,804), hereinafter “Momotani.” Claims 6, 8, 9, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Momotani. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Momotani in view of Feldstein (U.S. Patent No. 5,621,297), hereinafter “Feldstein.” Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Momotani in view of Maurer (U.S. Patent No. 6,179,984), hereinafter “Maurer.” Claims 10-18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Momotani in view of Fazakas (U.S. Patent No. 6,479,969), hereinafter “Fazakas.” Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections on the following grounds.

With respect to the Office’s use of the Momotani reference, Applicants note that the patent number cited in the Office Action of 5,614,804 is incorrect. The correct patent number for Momotani is 5,614,805. Applicants presume this to be a typographical error and have based the arguments presented below on Momotani as U.S. Patent No. 5,614,805.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants contend that Momotani fails to disclose each and every feature of the claim. For example, Momotani fails to disclose “the first power converter, triggered by the pulse generator, is arranged to generate positive pulses of current having a duration of between 50 to 1000 microseconds; the electrochemical device having a settling time of between 1 to 10 milliseconds to produce a duty cycle of between 1:10 to 1:200.” See claim 1. Momotani is silent as to the generation of positive pulses of current having a

duration of between 50 to 1000 microseconds. More particularly, in Col. 11, lines 21-23, Momotani discloses that the “pulse duty ratio is not related to the effect of the present invention.” In other words, Momotani provides that the pulse duty ratio is not at all applicable to the charged technique outlined in Momotani. Accordingly, Applicants contend that Momotani fails to teach each and every feature of claim 1.

Applicants further contend that claim 1 is not obvious in view of Momotani. The Office asserts that “where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or working ranges involves only routine skill in the art.” See Office Action, page 5. However, Applicants assert that a person having ordinary skill in the art would not obviously look to Momotani for a solution. Claim 1 provides that positive pulses of current having duration of between 50 to 1000 microseconds are generated, a settling time of between 1 to 10 milliseconds to produce a duty cycle of between 1:10 to 1:200, and a negative discharge pulse is generated to occur before or after one or more of the positive pulses. Applicants contend that the charging current in claim 1 varies with the state of charge. In sharp contrast, Momotani provides that the pulse repetition frequency is constant until charging is terminated. See Col. 11, lines 35-37. Accordingly, Applicants contend that Momotani fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1 and respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejection. Additionally, Applicants request that rejections of similarly recited claim 22 be withdrawn in light of the above arguments.

Since claims 2-21 depend from claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the Office also withdraw the rejections with respect these claims.

With respect to the other claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants contend

that Feldstein, Maurer, and Fazakas fail to overcome the deficiencies of Momotani, discussed above. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of rejections based upon combinations of Momotani and Feldstein, Maurer, or Fazakas.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Date: March 4, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Elaine Chi/

Elaine Chi
Reg. No.: 61,194

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)